DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 928 CG 019 707

AUTHOR Gattiker, Urs E.; And Others
TITLE Income Inequality Based on Gender and Position: Possible Effects on Perception of Career Success.
SPONS AGENCY Lethbridge Univ. (Alberta).
PUB DATE [Apr 87]
CONTRACT 86-1934-405
GRANT 11149
NOTE 34p.; Financial support for this research project was also provided in part by the Alberta Manpower "STEP" Program.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Employed Women; *Employer Employee Relationship; *Employment Level; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Foreign Countries; *Salary Wage Differentials; Sex Bias; Sex Differences; Sex Discrimination; *Success
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT

A major concern for researchers and managers alike is the inequality in the workforce based on gender and position. Researchers have found that women tend to hold disproportionately lower positions than men and receive remuneration of about 60 cents to the dollar compared to their male peers. This study assessed inequality in wage and position based on gender and whether employees perceived success differently looking at their gender and level in the organization. Employers (N=28) representing large and medium-size Canadian firms, educational institutions, and government agencies were surveyed. Each employer selected three to six successful managers (female and male) and an equal number of support personnel from a variety of departments. Managers identified female respondents and then matched male participants in positions with similar job complexity and responsibility. Responses were received from 296 of those employees who were asked to participate. Respondents completed an anonymous questionnaire about their subjective career success including success in finance, interpersonal relationships at work, and non-work spheres. Results indicated: (1) income and position inequality existed for females; (2) females seemed to perceive themselves as successful as their male counterparts, except for female managers; and (3) possible role and status conflicts existed for female managers between job and non-work expectations. The argument that inequality in income based on gender in particular and its limited effect on a person's dispositional assessment of career success suggests some necessary revisions of models of career development and women's status in the workforce. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278928

INCOME INEQUALITY BASED ON GENDER AND POSITION: POSSIBLE EFFECTS ON PERCEPTION OF CAREER SUCCESS[1]

Urs E. Gattiker

Cynthia Cunningham

Todd W. Nelligan

The University of Lethbridge

Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada

CG 019707

Short Title: Career Success

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Urs E. Gattiker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1 We would like to thank Larry Coe for his assistance in collecting and analyzing that data. Financial support for this research project was provided by The University of Lethbridge Research Fund, under Contract No. 86-1934-405, and by a grant from the Alberta Manpower "STEP" Program, Contract No. 11149. The views expressed in this paper are the authors' own and are not necessarily shared by these organizations. Requests for reprints should be addressed to Urs. E. Gattiker, School of Management, The University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Alberta, T1K 3M4, Canada.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INCOME INEQUALITY BASED ON GENDER AND POSITION: POSSIBLE EFFECTS ON PERCEPTION OF CAREER SUCCESS1

Abstract

This study assessed inequality in wage and position based on gender. A scale measuring subjective career success was also used to examine whether employees perceive success differently looking at their gender and their hierarchical level in the organization. Results in this study indicate, first, that income as well as position inequality do exist for female respondents. Secondly, the data shows that females seem to perceive themselves as successful as their male counterparts, except for women in managerial positions. The results indicate possible role and status conflicts for female managers between job and non-work expectations. The implications of these findings are discussed in terms of career development, women in the workforce and equity theory.

INCOME INEQUALITY BASED ON GENDER AND POSITION: POSSIBLE EFFECTS ON PERCEPTION OF CAREER SUCCESS[1]

A major concern for researchers and managers alike is the inequality in the workforce based on gender and position. Researchers have found that women in the U.S. tend to hold disproportionately lower positions than men and receive remuneration of about 60 cents to the dollar compared to their male peers (e.g., Blau & Ferber, 1985). Nonetheless, data also indicates that women perceive job characteristics similarly to men. In other words, income inequality may not affect their dispositions about their work and jobs (Mortimer & Sorensen, 1984). Such results may, in part, be explained by womens' learning of sex roles which condition women to look more to home/family life spheres than men (Wagner, Ford, & Ford, 1986). One could argue that women may compensate for lower career success by having successful home/family activities.

This paper will concentrate on four issues. First, the paper will try to test if women are less successful than men in their careers when looking at objective measures of career success (income and level in organization). Second, the paper will investigate if such objective inequality leads to differences in the individual's perception of career success. Third, we will try to illuminate how possible role and status conflicts of successful women may affect their perception of non-work related success. Fourth, the study will test if equity theory can be applied to careers by asking people about their perceptions of financial success using their peers and friends as reference points for comparison. So far, findings that bear on these issues have been presented in piecemeal fashion, but more comprehensive, integrative

studies are needed.

Literature Review

The approach presented here is interdisciplinary, drawing upon literature in sociology, social psychology, sociology, and management. Studies in four areas have a direct bearing on this research: disposition and work, career development, women and work and a person's hierarchical level in an organization. In the sections that follow, we provide a brief summary of recent work in the areas just mentioned and show how such work can be applied to the career success domain.

Perception of Career Success and Equity

In recent years, almost all research on career success and work attitudes has been situationally based. For instance, situational variables such as task characteristics, supervision, and ergonomics have been commonly isolated as determinants of job attitudes (Locke, 1976). Rarely, however, are work attitudes formulated as having an endogenous source of variance, one that is reflective of the ongoing state of the person as opposed to being a product of the situation.

Research testing equity theory has primarily concentrated on looking at the outcome of pay (Greenberg & Ornstein, 1983). Changes in an individual's performance are usually interpreted by equity theory as a behavioral attempt by the individual to adjust inputs (i.e. contributions) so as to match the ratio of one's outcomes (i.e., rewards) to inputs to that of some standard of comparison (e.g., ones peers). Romney, Smith, Freeman, Kagan and Klein (1979) have argued that an individual will assess his/her career success by using first one's internal career concept and second, taking peers as well as friends and individuals in other firms, but similar positions as standards of comparison.

The hypothesis that personal dispositions in combination with the concept of equity can affect work and attitudinal outcomes can draw support from three separate findings. First, there is substantial individual variation in the perception of tasks and work situations that have identical formal job descriptions (O'Reilly, Parlette, & Bloom, 1980). There is enough ambiguity in work and career situations which allow individuals to interpret it to fit their disposition. Second, there is substantial evidence that inequity in one's job situation is linked to lower performance (Greenberg & Ornstein, 1983). Inequity in salary leading to lower dispositions when it comes to financial success in a person's career has not been tested yet, however. People may, for instance, rationalize the situation, thereby justifying inequity, and as a result still feel as successful as their peer with a higher income (Gattiker & Larwood, 1987). A third piece of data supporting the dispositional perspective is the fact that one's situation (manager or support personnel) can lead to differences in one's disposition about career success (Gattiker & Larwood, 1986).

An Individual's Disposition about Career Success

The dispositional approach involves the measurement of personal characteristics and the assumption that such measures can aid in explaining individual attitudes and behaviour. Although distinctions are sometimes made, the terms personal disposition, traits, personality, and individual characteristics are used almost interchangeably in the literature. Each of these terms is based on a set of common assumptions: that it is possible to characterize people on certain dimensions, that these dimensions have some stability over time, and these dimensions are useful in prediciting individual behavior across situations.

In order to demonstrate dispositional sources of career success attitudes, it is also important to establish consistency across groups to show that behaviour can be predicted across disparate contexts as well as within them (cf. Mischel, 1968). For instance, Staw and Ross (1985) showed in their study that individual job attitudes do not change across situations due to job changes. However, if job attitudes do not change across situations nor over time (e.g., Staw, Bell & Clausen, 1986) it would be interesting to see if groups (e.g., managers vs. support personnel) differ in career success attitudes.

Some researchers have raised questions about the usefulness of objective measures explaining people's true feelings about themselves. For instance, Korman, Wittig-Berman and Lang (1981) found that top managers felt dissatisfied with their careers and sometimes even alienated with their work. Van Maanen and Schein (1977) have argued that our understanding about careers will improve if researchers accept the fact that objective measures of career success represent external career paths while subjective measures represent internal paths. In other words, successful managers may be in situations that are not congruent with their own internal concept (Schein, 1980). As such, a Fortune 500 executive may have a dream of being a successful trapper in the Alaskan wilderness instead of sitting in an executive suite.

An individual's disposition about his/her state of career success is of utmost importance in a society which values career success highly (Bandura, 1982). Gattiker (1985) did an open-ended survey asking white collar workers to answer questions about what they considered to be career success, success on the job and in non-work areas. He asked individuals to try to outline what they felt would distinguish career success for a manager and support staff. Based on his content anal-

ysis, he came up with four major facets of a person's disposition about career success, these being job success, financial success, interpersonal success and general success. The data indicated that managers tended to be more focused on job success while support staff was mostly concerned with financial success. And of equal importance, women did not really differ from male respondents in how they described career success.

The above indicates that knowledge about people's disposition toward their own career success is limited indeed. This is relatively suprising, since some research indicates that individuals tend to depict situations in their own way, leading to interpretations which are detrimental to judgments made by a neutral outsider (e.g., O'Reilly, Parlette & Bloom, 1980). This, in turn, would seem to make it necessary to assess subjective career success to assure an ideal job-person fit (Brousseau, 1983). More research into this phenomena could illuminate the applicability of equity theory to a person's disposition toward career success. In other words, it seems feasible that inequity should lead to some attitudinal outcomes as indicated by the literature (e.g., Greenbaum & Ornstein, 1983), but may not affect one's feeling about one's career success.

Inequality in the Workplace

Historically, the division of labour has been such that men have specialized in market work and women have specialized in child care and other household work (O'Neill, 1985). Attitudes toward working women have been changing; however, behaviors such as treating women unequally have not (Crosby, Clyton, Alksnis & Hemker, 1986).

Gender and wage inequality. Research indicates that women receive lower remuneration for similar jobs done by their male peers. Although

sex differences in labour market achievements are well documented, attempts to account for earning inequality between women and men as well as managers and support-personnel have met with only partial success (Coverman, 1983). Kemp and Beck (1986) did a study comparing women doing equal work with men. The results indicated that women had lower salaries even though their jobs were of equal worth using the U.S. Department of Labor Dictionary of Occupational Titles to classify and match respondents.

One underresearched mechanism that may, in part, account for a major component of the sex gap in income is the lack of dispositional differences when it comes to subjective career success. In other words, even though objective differences such as income may be apparent to the outsider, women may not feel unequally treated, and may perceive themselves being as successful as their male colleagues. As a result, women may not see a reason for change, nor attempt to initiate such to eliminate inequality (O'Neill, 1985). Few studies, however, have directly investigated this proposition.

Gender and career success disposition. The basic issue raised in the above section is: do wage inequalities lead to differences in women's disposition to career success? Taking the equity theory to help answer this question, one would have to argue that wage inequality will eventually lead the individual to lower his/her assessment of career success. This interpretation, however, does not obtain much support from research. Since individuals tend to rationalize the situation they see themselves in, they may not lower their success assessment nor may they feel a need to react behaviorally such as lowering their performance (e.g., Gattiker & Larwood, 1987; Porac & Meindl, 1982).

Using a sociological approach to answer the above question would lead to a slightly different response. For example, it is assumed that the primary focus of socialization is the learning of sex roles. In particular, various skills, capacities, and affect states associated with each sex become internalized as dispositions form through childhood and adolescent socialization. Wagner, Ford and Ford (1986) have argued that to be male is to deal with "problems" or "objects," to be "task-oriented" and "coldly rational." In contrast, a female is to deal with "people" and "feelings," to be "process-oriented" and "warmly expressive". Because these characteristics come to be affective dispositions, they may influence ones self-perceived disposition of career success1 (cf. Gattiker, in press; Staw, Bell & Clausen, 1986).

The dispositional approach would state that gender inequalities result from differences in the repertoires of attitudes to which men and women are socialized. Again, women may feel as successful as men in their careers even though wage inequalities may exist (cf. Mortimer & Sorensen, 1984).

The above indicates that neither position (equity, rational behavior or socialization) by itself can account for all possible dispositional effects. A person's position in the workforce may very well affect how much he/she goes by traditional roles. As such, it is likely that a female manager may have the greatest difficulty in feeling successful in non-work spheres because she does not fit the "traditional" female role (Crosby, 1982, chap. 7). Her status at work may be far higher than at home, and, using socialized role models, the female manager may feel guilty about not fitting the traditional non-work role (cf. Beutell & Greenhaus, 1983).

Gender and hierarchical position. Status characteristics theory

assumes that status roles are more basic in the determination of dispositions than are specific sex roles (e.g., Berger, Fisek, Norman & Zelditch, 1977). As a result, women in a managerial position have a higher level status at work than outside work (Berger, Rosenholtz & Zelditch, 1980). One could say that female managers may evaluate their career success in the same way as their male colleagues, since work roles are quite similar. When it comes to non-work success such as family life, friends, etc., however, women managers may have to cope with a lower status. This conflict between the two status positions may lead to a lower assessment of non-work success than is the case for their male peers.

Some research tends to support the above argument. For instance, Gattiker (1985) found that female managers felt themselves not being successful in such areas as private and family life. Some explanations given by the interviewed women were that they felt their careers made them "neglect" their traditional roles of being a mother and housewife. Their high work status did not allow them to adequately fill their "traditional" socialized roles. Crosby (1982, chap. 2) discovered that women felt more deprived in their work and career gratification because of their conflicting status roles in and outside the work environment.

The above results raise the question, why differences in a person's disposition of career success might not occur for non-managerial female and male employees? One explanation could be that low level status at work and outside work for women in support positions may very well fit their socialized role concept (Coverman, 1983). To the authors' best knowledge, however, no research to date has tested the possibility of differences in people's assessment of non-work related success as well as career success based on gender and hierarchical level

combined.

Summary and Conclusion

Previous research has usually examined gender inequalities either based on external career success factors such as income or external career success such as one's disposition about career success (e.g., Gattiker & Larwood, 1986; Wagner, Ford, Ford, 1986). The central concern of this investigation, while related to that of others (Gattiker, 1985), differs in an important way. Rather than focusing on either the objective or subjective assessment of career success based on gender, this study focuses on both simultaneously. If, indeed, wage and positional inequalities do exist in a random sample of office workers, then one issue of paramount importance is the objective inequality's relevance to the dispositional assessment of the situation when it comes to career success. A second critical aspect is to test if gender differences in one's assessment of career success may exist for managers only. If this is the case, the results would support earlier work about status theory and sex roles which claimed that women may have difficulty in coping with their different status positions and roles between work and non-work (e.g., Berger, Rosenholtz & Zelditch, 1980; Rexroat & Shehan, 1984). The third important focus of this study is to assess how much equity theory research in laboratory settings can be translated and applied to explain career success dispositions in applied settings.

Research Issues

The intention of this research was to answer the following questions:

Question 1. Are a disproportionate number of female respondents more likely to be in lower level positions, and, even if holding a man-

agement position, receiving lower wages than their male counterparts? To answer the above question, several models and their fit to the data will have to be tested. While the above question raises the issue of inequality using objective measures, the next research questions to be posed will deal with the person's disposition toward career success.

Question 2. Do managers differ in how they assess their subjective career success from support personnel?

Question 3. Do individuals differ in how they perceive career success based on their gender?

Question 4. Do female managers' disposition about general success differ from their male counterparts?

In summary, what distinguishes the above approach is the fact that it represents a first for testing if objectively measured inequality manifests itself in a person's disposition about his/her career success; second, researchers have looked at objective differences two at a time (e.g., gender vs. income); however, question 1 allows looking at several relationships and interactions at the same time; and thirdly, the study assesses possible effects of high-status work done by females on their perception of non-work success.

Method

Design and Subjects

A stratified sample of twenty eight employers was asked to participate in a survey of personnel and their "career success." The employers represented these groups: 10 were firms selected at random from the Globe and Mail annual roster of Canada's largest organizations; 12 companies were medium-sized firms from Western Canada; the final six comprised three educational institutions and three government agencies. Except for the stipulation of their locale (Western Canada),

organizations were recruited randomly within each classification.

Organizational type was not a variable of interest here. The educational and government institutions were included because they brought potentially different organizational cultures and constructs of effectiveness to the sample, thus allowing more reliable generalizations from the findings (cf. Blalock, 1984, chap. 4).

All employers were asked to select three to six successful managers (female and male) and an equal number of support personnel from a variety of departments, and to distribute a questionnaire to these individuals. In order to avoid influencing selection decisions, organizations themselves determined what they considered to be "successful." Surveys were returned directly to the researchers.

To facilitate the comparison between men and women, managers were asked to first identify female respondents and then match male participants in positions with similar job complexity and responsbility. This approach has been suggested as one method to assure that comparisons between sexes are made based on equal work. This avoids the problem of assumed equal weighting of job complexity and manipulation of data, people and things as done by the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) which may not be an accurate reflection of reality (Kemp & Beck, 1986).

Of the 380 people asked to participate in the study, 340 agreed and 296 responses were ultimately received (87%). Respondents included both sexes (about 66% were female) and approximately 65% were married.

Instrument

Respondents completed an anonymous questionnaire to assess their subjective career success, specifically, if they felt successful in such areas as finance, interpersonal relationships at work and job

related areas, as well as non-work success spheres. A five-point scale, ranging from (1) "agree completely" to (5) "disagree completely" was provided. The original scale with 25 items had been developed by Gattiker (1985) using open-ended questions to elicit information from U.S. respondents about subjective career success. Based on an item-analysis, Gattiker (1985) then constructed 25 items based on the response patterns obtained with the open-ended questions. Participants used were office workers in a variety of organizations. Gattiker and Larwood (1986) used the scale with a different sample in the U.S. comparing managerial and non-managerial employees.

Based on the above two applications, Gattiker and Cunningham (in press) developed an expanded version with 38 items. The latter's instrument was used in this study. The dimensions measured by this scale are labelled (1) job success, (2) financial success, (3) interpersonal success, and (4) general success. The financial success portion required individuals to compare themselves to their peers and individuals in similar positions outside the firm (see Appendix I). This would allow testing for the applicability of equity theory to career development. For instance, research derived from equity theory suggests that employees evaluate their pay and security by contrasting their own with those of comparative referents such as co-workers (Oldham, Kulik, Stepina, & Ambrose, 1986). The final section of the questionnaire concerned demographics, asking about annual income, educational background, job title and the like.

Analyses

Two types of multivariate analyses were used to test the data obtained in this study. First, the data was tested for association between the dichotomous variables, gender (female vs. male) and hier-

archical level (manager vs. support personnel) and the trichotomous income variable (less than $20,000, $20-39,999 and $40,000 and more). Log-linear analyses were done testing for no effects, simple effects and two-way interaction effects.

The second type of analyses was MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) and Anova (univariate analysis of variance) which were used to compare the scores of each of the groups (managers vs. support personnel; female vs. male) on the five factors measuring disposition of career success.

Results

In order to facilitate a logical presentation of our results, they will be divided into four sections, according to the relevant research questions outlined earlier.

Question 1. The question posed was if an interaction would be apparent between a person's gender, hierarchical level and one's income. To test if a disproportionate number of female respondents would be in lower level positions as well as drawing lower pay, a log-linear analysis was done.

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 1 shows the results of several models. Bonnett and Bentler (1983) suggested that by using a completely restricted model (Mean), an additional reference point for evaluation can be used for comparing the models. The results indicate that the single effects of gender, hierarchical level and income improve the fit of the model considerably ($\Delta G2 = 309.17$). Adding the two way interaction between gender and income to the single effects model again significantly improves the fit as does adding gender times hierarchical level. With 2 degrees of freedom left and all two way interactions included, the model repre-

sents a nearly perfect fit.

Bonnet and Bentler (1983) also suggested looking at the Goodman's Norm Fit Index which calculates the amount of total variance reduced by each model. This indicates that by including all one-way effects and the two-way gender effects, the amount of variance can be reduced by 95.2% which is considered a good fit (Bonnet & Bentler, 1983). The derivatives2 indicate that the model calculates far fewer women to be in higher level positions than men. Furthermore, these figures also show that women are usually in lower paying positions compared to men. These results indicate that interactions exist between the person's genders, his/her hierarchical level and income. In other words, income inequality exists between females in managerial as well as support positions when compared to their male peers in this sample.

Question 2. The issue posed in this question was if managers would differ from support personnel in how they assess their career success. To test this question a MANOVA as well as ANOVA analysis was done using a person's hierarchical level as the dependent variable, while the disposition factors were the independent variables. Looking at Pillai's V in Table 2 (H with effects of S removed, 1.90) indicates that a person's hierarchical level by itself does not explain differences in success disposition looking at all four factors simultaneously.

Insert Table 2 about here

The univariate F-tests, however, indicate that managers and support personnel differ ($p<.05$, using a two-tail test of the means) in how they assess job success. Support personnel perceive themselves as less successful than managers in their jobs. No statistically significant differences were recorded for financial, interpersonal and general success between managers and support personnel. This means that ques-

tion 2 can be answered positively with some reservations only because apart from job success, no differences were recorded.

Question 3. The issue under investigation here is if individuals differ in how they perceive career success based on their gender. Looking at Table 2 the results indicate that gender does not account for overall differences when looking at respondent's overall success disposition (1.12). When the effects of hierarchical level are not removed, however, Pillai's V is significant (2.56, $p<.05$). The univariate F-tests indicate that individual's differ based on their gender when it comes to job and financial success. Looking at the means indicates that women perceive themselves to be less successful on the job and financially ($p<.05$, using a two-tail test of the means). Looking at sex alone to account for possible hierarchical effects, however, indicates that women may not differ from men. Therefore, question 3 has to be answered with a cautious yes/no since women appear to differ, but the effect is "washed out" by controlling for hierarchical effects.

Question 4. This last question raised the issue of female manager's dispositions toward general success possibly differing from their male counterparts. According to Table 2, this appears to be true when looking at the sex and hierarchical level interaction. Pillai's V is barely significant, indicating an overall effect when looking at all factors simultaneously. Nevertheless, women differ on general success. Looking at the means for female and male managers indicates that the former perceive themselves to be less successful in non-work spheres than their male colleagues ($p<.05$, using a two-tail test of the means). Based on this result, it seems appropriate to answer this question positively in that female managers do differ in

how they perceive their general success from male managers.

Discussion

The data here reveal that there is a substantial degree of wage inequity between female and male respondents in this sample. It also appears that females receive lower remuneration in managerial as well as non-managerial positions than their male colleagues. Kemp and Beck's (1986) claim that there is still wage inequality even though males and females are doing exactly the same type of labour seems confirmed by this data.

Concerning the theoretical model, strong support was found that objective career success differences along gender and income do not transpire through to the person's disposition toward his/her career success. First, even though support personnel earn less than managers, the former did not feel they had less financial success using peers and colleagues in other firms as a standard of comparison. This result is in contrast to equity theory which claims that inequity should lead to negative attitudinal and behavioral outcomes (e.g., Greenberg & Ornstein, 1983).

The respondents did, however, differ in how they assessed job success. One interpretation could be that the quality of job life such as job complexity, decision-making and variety in one's work are not yet to the support personnel's liking. At a first glance, this may suggest job redesign efforts should help remedy this problem, but these efforts often fail to remedy the problem (White, 1978).

Perhaps more important, however, is the result from Table 2 which indicates that females did not perceive themselves to be less successful when compared to men. The results in Table 2 illustrate that the dispositional approach to career success may illuminate why

women, in some cases, lack the impulse to change inequality in the workplace, even though sex discrimination may exist in the form of unequal pay.

This lower status relegated to women can also be seen in the interrelationship between a person's hierarchical level and career success. A status conflict may exist for women in their non-work life, even though they may hold managerial positions. The data indicates that women's higher work status is not retained outside work because women traditionally have a lower status at home (O'Neill, 1985), while male managers feel more successful in their non-work life. These results confirm the applicability of status characteristics theory to career research (cf. Berger, Fisek, Norman & Zelditch, 1977). These women, then, may experience a sex role conflict (e.g., Gattiker, 1985) because their work roles do not fit the traditional roles at home of being a homemaker, mother, or wife supporting one's family, husband and/or friend in their career endeavours (Pfeffer & Ross, 1982; Ward & Mueller, 1986). In our analyses, we did not examine directly the possible status nor role conflict; however, the results obtained make such an interpretation possible.

Turning to the disconfirming findings, the results indicate that inequality in objective career success (hierarchical level and income) does not necessarily manifest itself in subjective career success. To the researchers, this finding is most important and thought provoking. It questions the possible advancement of women in the workforce because their career success disposition does not indicate unequal differences between themselves and men. Women in support positions may feel resigned to inequality in pay and promotion (cf. Rosenbaum, 1985). This, however, may make the realization of equal rights at the

workplace a difficult thing to accomplish because neither the current power holders (males) nor the discriminated against group (majority thereof) may push for change to accomplish this desirable goal (Larwood, Gutek & Gattiker, 1984).

To conclude, the most important contribution of this study is that it begins to apply external and internal career concepts to the research about career success as demanded by some (e.g., Schein, 1980; Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Equity theory suggests that employees evaluate specific work facets. With a few exceptions (Oldham, Kulik, Stepin & Ambrose (1986) such work has usually been done in laboratory settings. What may be significant in this context is the fact that equity theory fails to apply when it comes to one's disposition of career success in a non-laboratory setting. Equity theory may apply to a person's career disposition when studying undergraduate students in a laboratory setting (cf. Greenberg & Ornstein, 1983), but it fails to materialize for working adults and their career success constructs.

Conclusions

A person's gender and managerial level were important factors when assessing one's career success dispositon. Further work in this area is necessary to reconfirm our results. The individual's need for personal achievement and desire for career success should guide management when striving for an optimum job-person fit. Our findings should be of help in meeting this goal.

Theoretical Implications

The argument that inequality in income based on gender in particular and its limited effect on a person's dispositional assessment of career success suggests some necessary revisions of our models of career development and women's status in the workforce. One possibil-

ity is that expected work roles, internal and external career paths and social information about one's career situation are three separate or independent determinants of one's career success dispositions. Another possibility is that these three sources of career success are highly interactive. For example, Rexroat and Shehan (1984) found that women's career plans and expected work roles do seem to materialize over the long-term. In other words, women who expect to remain in the labour force most likely tend to coordinate their career and domestic roles so that their plans and work-role behaviour are similar. As a result, however, this can lead to the interaction where women in managerial position with lower income than their peers feel less financially successful as reported in this study because it does not fit their work role and their perception of equality (cf. Rexroat & Shehan, 1984).

Future research may find, for example, the perception of career success is conditioned by attitudinal cues from both internal (career success disposition) and external (social) sources. Alternatively, we may find that external and internal cues are moderated by the realities of work life such as economic growth rates and demographical factors which may hinder or facilitate an individual's career progress. Although research about inequality has shifted from focussing on the characteristics of individuals to focussing on the attributes of larger social structures such as the firm, an additional shift converging on dispositional outcomes is necessary. Wage inequality may, in part, be explained by its limited effect on people's dispositions about their careers and themselves. For instance, if women compare themselves with peers in less fortunate positions, they can still feel successful and fairly treated. In turn, this may make any change unnecessary from the person's point of view, thereby eliminating social pressure from the

discriminated against group (Crosby, 1982).

Practical Implications

In terms of practical issues, the most obvious implication of our findings concerns the usefulness of career development and affirmative action programs. One of the major objectives of career development and affirmative action programs is to help female employees to progress in the organization, but still achieve a fit between organizational as well as individual needs. Women's status in non-work situations and society's behavior toward women may have to change to support women in their quest for status and income equality in organizational settings. Even affirmative action programs may, for example, be prone to failure, because they must contend with strong external forces-forces that, for instance, make females plan to stay at home due to marriage or children. Some women may be resigned to objective inequality as a matter of life and rationalize they are as successful as their male peers. On the other hand, women with employment intentions and career plans may violate the prevailing sex-role norms but still be willing to accept inequality at work since society has taught them to specialize in child-care and other household work (O'Neill, 1985). Women may be willing to manage one conflict situation (gainful employment instead of household work), but may not have the energy and support systems necessary to challenge income inequality (female managers).

Career development efforts need to be more extensive and include more environmental considerations besides psychological factors. For managers this would mean that it is important to discuss career plans with females to assess what work role the individual may have in mind and how it might be achieved. For instance, women with high status expectations and long range plans for labour force participation may

benefit form the use of outside paid help to do part of the housework. This, in turn, may reduce women's lower perception of general success as recorded in this study, since traditional role demands are taken care of by a paid helper.

Managers must also have vision, however, so as to discuss in realistic terms the obstacles that face career motivated women. The age structure in North America will prevent many younger individuals to raise through the ranks as their older colleagues did. Already, investment bankers in their early thirties advise their younger colleagues of their bleaker future. Career expectations that are set too high may not be achievable because hierarchical progress may largely be blocked (cf. Driver, 1985). This could mean that the future generation may not be able to realize their career dreams, leading to major conflicts for young women who plan to stay in the workforce and have high status expectations for their work. The challenge will be to help these women and men even though economic and demographical circumstances make this difficult. These are the challenges before us as we investigate the role of career success looking at the external and internal perspective.

Footnotes

1) In this paper, disposition is a self-perceived construct. It includes, but is not limited to, one's predispositions about working and subjective career success. In other words, a self-perceived disposition represents the evaluative side of one's attitudes toward career success. An attitude is generally seen as a disposition to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner to an object (Oskamp, 1977, pp. 2-12). This paper concentrates on the evaluative aspect of dispositions which has been increasingly stressed in the literature.

2) The derivatives generated by the log-linear analysis are not included here due to space limitations but can be obtained from any one of the authors.

Appendix

I am

Job Success

receiving positive feedback about my performance from all quarters.

offered opportunities for further education by my employer

pleased with the promotions I have received so far

having enough responsibility on my job

in a job which offers promotional opportunities

reaching my career goals within the time frame I set

fully backed by management in my work

going to reach all my career goals

in a job which offers me a chance to learn new skills

most happy when I am at work

offered challenges at my work

having my superior's confidence

in a position to do mostly work which I really like

in a position to set my own goals

enjoying the challenging goals I have on my current job

praised often by my superior(s)

dedicated to my work

offered opportunities for promotion by my employer

Financial Success

receiving fair compensation compared to my peers

drawing a high income compared to my peers

earning as much as I think my work is worth

earning enough to pay my bills

obtaining a salary which supports my current lifestyle

paid well when compared to similar jobs in other companies

Interpersonal Success

getting positive performance feedback from my peers

setting my own timeframe for career goals

often doing something with my peers outside of work

often asked for advice on private matters by my peers

frequently getting feedback from my peers about my performance

consulted often to advise a colleague on a job matter

respected by my peers

General Success

happy with my private life

accepted by my peers

enjoying my non-work activities

satisfied with my life overall

having the confidence of my peers

enjoying spending my spare time with friends

enjoying a happy family life (spouse/partner, children, etc.)

References

Bandura, A. (1982). The psychology of chance encounters and life paths. American Psychologist, 37, 747-755.

Berger, J., Rosenholtz, S. J. & Zelditch, M. (1980). Status organizing processes. Annual Review of Sociology, 6, 479-508.

Beutel, N. J., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1983). Integration of home and nonhome roles: Women's conflict and coping behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 43-48.

Blalock, H. M. (1984). Basic dilemmas in the social sciences. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Blau, F. D., & Ferber, M. A. (1985). Women in the labor market--The last twenty years. In L. Larwood, A. H. Stromberg, & B. A. Gutek (Eds.), Women and work (Vol. 1) (pp. 19-49). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Bonett, D. G., & Bentler, P. M. (1983). Goodness-of-fit procedures for the evaluation and selection of log-linear models. Psychological Bulletin, 93, 149-166.

Brousseau, K. R. (1983). Toward a dynamic model of job-person relationships: Findings, research questions, and implications for work system design. Academy of Management Review, 8 (pp. 33-45).

Coverman, S. (1983). Gender, domestic labor time, and wage inequality. American Sociological Review, 48, 623-637.

Crosby, F. J. (1982). Relative deprivation & working women. New York: Oxford University Press.

Crosby, F. J., Clayton, S., Alksnis, O., & Hemker, K. (1986). Cognitive biases in the perception of discrimination: The importance of format. Sex Roles, 14, 637-662.

DiPrete, T. A., & Soule, W. T. (1986). The organization of career lines: Equal employment opportunity and status advancement in a federal bureaucracy. American Sociological Review, 51, 295-309.

Driver, M. J. (1985). Demographic and societal factors affecting the linear career crisis. Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 2, 245-263.

Driver, M. J. (1979). Care concept and career management in organizations. In C. J. Cooper (Ed.), Behavioral problems in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Gattiker, U. E. (1985). Organizational careers: Developing a construct of career success (Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 4409A.

Gattiker, U. E., & Cunningham, C. (in press). End-user computing and self-perceived dispositions: Working with computers and career success. In U. E. Gattiker and L. Larwood (Eds.), Technological innovations and human resources (Vol. I). Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.

Gattiker, U. E. & Larwood, L. (1986). Career success and organizational position: A study of managers and support personnel. Journal of Business and Psychology, 1, 77-87.

Gattiker, U. E., & Larwood, L. (1987). A study of potential predictors for corporate manager's objective and subjective career success. Working paper, The University of Lethbridge.

Greenberg, J., & Ornstein, S. (1983). High status job title as compensation for underpayment: A test of equity theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 285-297.

Gutek, B. A., Larwood, L., & Stromberg, A. (1986). Women at work. In C. L. Cooper and I. Robertson (Eds.), International Review of

Industrial and Organizational Psychology, (pp. 217 - 234).

Kemp, A. A., & Beck, E. M. (1986). Equal work, unequal pay. Work and Occupations, 13, 324-347.

Korman, A. K., Wittig-Berman, U., & Lang, D. (1981). Career success and personal failure: Alienation in professionals and managers. Academy of Management Journal, 24, 342-360.

Larwood, L., Gutek, B. A., & Gattiker, U. E. (1984). Perspectives on institutional discrimination and resistance to change. Group and Organization Studies, 9, 333-352.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Mischel, W. (1968). Personality and assessment. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Mortimer, J. T., & Sorensen, G. (1984). Men, women, work, and family. In K. M. Borman, D. Quarm, & S. Gideonse (Eds.), Women in the workplace: effects on families (pp. 139-167). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oldham, G. R., Kulik, C. T., Stepina, L. P. & Ambrose, M. L. (1986). Relations between situational factors and the comparative referents used by employees. Academy of Management Journal, 29, 599-608.

O'Neill, J. (1985). Role differentiation and the gender gap in wage rates. In L. Larwood, A. H. Stromberg, & B. A. Gutek (Eds.), Women and Work (Vol. 1) (pp. 50-75). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

O'Reilly, Ch. A., Parlett, N. G., & Bloom, R. (1980). Perceptual measures of task characteristics: The erasing effect of differing frames of references and job attitudes. Academy of Management Journal, 23, 118-131.

Oskamp, S. (1977). Attitudes and opinions. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Porac, J. F. & Meindl, J. (1982). Undermining overjustification: Including intrinsic and extrinsic task representations. Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 29, 208-226.

Rexroat, C. & Shehan, C. (1984). Expected versus actual work roles of women. American Sociological Review, 49, 349-358.

Romney, A. K., Smith, T., Freeman, H. E., Kagan, J., & Klein, R. E. (1979). Concepts of success and failure. Social Science Research, 8, 302-326.

Rosenbaum, J. E. (1985). Persistence and change in pay inequalities: Implications for job evaluation and comparable worth. In L. Larwood, A. H. Stromberg, & B. A. Gutek (Eds.), Women and work (Vol. 1) (pp. 115-140). Bevery Hills: Sage Publications.

Schein, E. H. (1980). Career theory and research: Some issues for the future. In C. B. Derr (Ed.), Work, family and the career (pp. 357-365). New York: Praeger.

Staw, B. M., & Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 70, 469-480.

Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. Administrative Science Quarterly, 31, 56-77.

Stokes, J. P., & Peyton, J. S. (1986). Attitudinal differences be-

tween full-time homemakers and women who work outside the home. Sex Roles, 15, 299-310.

Van Maanen, J., Schein, E. H. (1977). Career development. In J. R. Hackman & J. L. Shuttle (Eds.), Improving life at work. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.

Wagner, D., Ford, R. S., & Ford, T. W. (1986). Can gender inequalities be reduced? American Sociological Review, 51, 47-61.

Ward, K. B., & Mueller, Ch. W. (1986). Sex differences in earnings. Work and Occupations, 12, 437-463.

Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R. D., Sechrest, L., & Grove, J. B. (1981). Nonreative measures in the social sciences (2nd Ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Znanieck Lopata, H., Fordham Norr, D., Barnewolt, D., & Miller Ch. A. (1985). Job complexity as perceived by workers and experts. Work and Occupations, 12, 395-415.

Table 1

Log-Linear Analysis: Testing for Possible Interaction Between Gender, Hierarchical Level and Income

Model	Used DF	DF Left	G2	G2	Goodman's Norm Fit Index
Mean	1	11	478.91***		
				309.17	
[G,H,I]	5	7	169.74***		.646
				98.19	
[G,H,I, G x I]	2	5	71.55***		.851
				48.54	
[G,H,I,GI, G x H]	1	4	23.01***		.952
				22.84	
[G,H,I,GI,GH, I x H]	2	2	.17		1.00

G : Sex
H : Hierarchical level
I : Income

***p<.001

Table 2

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Career Success Disposition

Source	Multivariate Tests of Pillai's V: N df	F (df)	Means (Univariate F-Tests): Job Success	Financial Success	Interpersonal Success	General Success
S (Sex)[1]	296	1 2.56xx (4,248)	(3.63x)	(5.84x)	(2.88)	(.16)
Female	189		2.55	2.82	2.81	1.76
Male	107		2.39	2.52	2.64	1.78
H (Hierarchical Level)[2]	296	1 3.12xx (4,248)	(6.82xx)	(.49)	(1.11)	(9.98x)
Managers	92		2.34	2.52	2.66	1.80
Support Personnel	199		2.57	2.80	2.79	1.76
S with effects of H removed[3]		1 1.12	(.72)	(2.64)	(1.48)	(.05)
H with effects of S removed[4]		1 1.90	(5.22x)	(2.27)	(.75)	(.12)
S x H[5]		1 2.18x	(.49)	(.57)	(.07)	(9.59x)

Note. Multivariate tests compare the two groups (e.g., managers vs support personnel) on all four factors simultaneously, using Pillai's V as calculated by SPSSX MANOVA, whereise univariate tests compare the groups on one factor at a time only. Univariate F tests are given in parentheses. Scale for means: 1 = Agree completely; 5 = Disagree completely.

1) S = gender or respondent (female versus male)
2) H = hierarchical level of respondent (manager versus support personnel)
3) Looking at gender effects having removed possible effects by the person's hierarchical level in the organization.
4) Looking at hierarchical effects having removed possible effects by the person's gender.
5) Looking at possible interaction effects between the person's gender and hierarchical level.

x $p < .07$
xx $p < .05$